DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. The following is a final office action in response to the communications received on March 6, 2008. Claims 1-32 are now pending in this application, claims 8-16 and 24-32 are withdrawn.

Response to Amendments

2. Applicants' amendments to claims 1 and 17 are acknowledged.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments filed on March 6, 2008 have been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicants argue the claims as amended. As such, a discussion of the amended claims is below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (Baker, Sunny; Baker, Kim; "The Complete Idiot's Guide to Project Management", Alpha Books, 2000) in view of Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6487479).

As per claim 1, Baker teaches "a computerized method of defining a work scope, comprising the steps of: selecting a desired task from said service bulletin" (see pp. 89-94 and 361-375; where a task can be selected. A work breakdown structure is the

same as a service bulletin.), "adding said desired task to a work scope" (see pp. 89-94 and 361-375; where tasks can be added to the project scope.), "determining whether a related task exists" (see pp. 89-94 and 361-375; where related tasks can be sequentially aligned. A determination of which tasks are related are done prior to the sequential aligning of tasks.), and "adding said related task to said work scope if said related task exists" (see pp. 89-94 and 361-375; where related tasks are added to the work scope.). Baker fails to explicitly teach that the feature of "adding said desired task to a work scope" is done "for a gas turbine engine". Examiner submits that the adding of said desired task for a gas turbine engine is merely an intended use of the present invention and should not be given patentable weight. The method being adapted "for a gas turbine engine" is irrelevant since the intended use does not change the overall functionality of the method. The intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Baker method at a gas turbine engine because the Baker method is designed to be used in a project management regardless of the intended use.

Baker additionally fails to explicitly teach "providing a service bulletin comprising original engine manufacturer data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a gas turbine engine". Nelson, in an analogous art, explicitly teaches "providing a service bulletin comprising original engine manufacturer data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a

gas turbine engine" (see Nelson column 1 lines 10-15 and column 3 lines 19-55, ; where a service bulletin with data regarding an engineering change to a gas turbine engine is disclosed.). The advantage of such a feature is that it facilitates proper maintenance. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine this feature taught by Nelson to Baker in order to ensure proper maintenance of parts. Examiner further submits that although art has been provided for this limitation, the contents of a service bulletin should not be given patentable weight. The written context of a service bulletin is nothing more than mere nonfunctional descriptive data. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP . 2106.*

As per claim 2, Baker teaches:

The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said related task comprises a prerequisite task or a concurrent task, and said related task adding step comprises automatically adding said prerequisite task or said concurrent task to said work scope (see pp. 89-94 and 361-375; where task sequencing is done.).

As per claim 3, Baker teaches:

The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said related task comprises a prerequisite task, a concurrent task, a superceding task or a recommended task, and said related task adding step comprises the steps of:

automatically substituting said desired task with said superceding task on said work scope (see pp. 89-101; where tasks are broken down into subtasks. Tasks are the superceding tasks can all subtasks are organized based on their related tasks. A project work scope can be listed to a detailed level using the subtasks or on a general overview using only task information.);

automatically adding said prerequisite task or said concurrent task to said work scope(see pp. 89-101; where tasks are broken down into subtasks. Tasks are the superceding tasks can all subtasks are organized based on their related tasks. A project work scope can be listed to a detailed level using the subtasks or on a general overview using only task information.); and

adding said recommended task to said work scope if a user seeks performance of said recommended task(see pp. 89-101; where tasks are broken down into subtasks. Tasks are the superceding tasks can all subtasks are organized based on their related tasks. A project work scope can be listed to a detailed level using the subtasks or on a general overview using only task information. Tasks quality can be further reviewed. Task quality is the same as performance of the task.).

As per claim 4, Baker teaches:

The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said determining step includes accessing a database to locate said related task (see pp. 361-375; where task information can be stored in a database.).

As per claim 5, Baker teaches:

The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the step of determining if said desired task or said related task has been previously performed (see pp. 89-94 and 361-375; where tasks status can be determined.).

As per claim 7, Baker fails to teach "wherein the work scope is performed on a gas turbine engine". However, Baker discloses a project management method that can be applied to a variety of industries, regardless of the intended field of use of the method. The system being adapted to be applied to a "gas turbine engine" is irrelevant since the intended use does not change the overall functionality of the system. The intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Baker method at a gas turbine engine because Baker method is designed to be used in project management regardless of the intended use.

Claims 17-23 recite a computer system taught by Baker (see pp. 361-375). Claims 17-23 further recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1-6; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan K. Deshpande whose telephone number is (571)272-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jeffrey A. Smith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3625

kkd